

Remarks/Arguments:

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, consideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

It is noted that claims 3-5, 7 and 9-11 have been amended, claims 8 and 32 have been cancelled, and claims 33-41 have been newly added. Accordingly, claims 3-5, 7, 9-11, 30-31, and 33-41 are currently pending in this application. It is submitted that no new matter has been added. It is further submitted that each of the currently pending claims is directed towards the invention elected in response to the restriction requirement issued by the Examiner on March 23, 2004. Moreover, it is noted that each of claims 3-5, 7, 9-11, and 33-41 has been drafted and/or amended so as to avoid being interpreted as a means-plus-function claim under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph.

It is noted with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated, on pages 4-5 of the Office Action, that defendant claim 9 contains allowable subject-matter and that claims 30-31 are allowable.

It is further noted that the Examiner has rejected claims 3-5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 103(a) on the basis of Sakurai (USPN: 6,130,962) for the reasons contained on pages 3-4 of the Office Action.

The Applicants would like to thank Examiner Frantz Colby for conducting a personal interview with the Applicants' representatives on July 14, 2005 at the United States Patent and Trademark Office. During the personal interview, the Applicants' representatives presented arguments traversing the aforementioned prior art rejection and distinguishing each of independent claims 8 and 32 over the prior art reference relied upon by the Examiner. As reflected on the interview summary (form PTOL-413), after conducting the personal interview, the Applicants amended independent claims 8 and 32 in the manner suggested by the Examiner during the personal interview and faxed such claims to the Examiner for his further consideration. During a telephone discussion with the Examiner after such further consideration, the Examiner indicated that amended claims 8 and 32, as faxed to the Examiner, would be effective to overcome the prior art rejection. Accordingly, the Examiner suggested that the Applicants should file the proposed claims in a formal amendment along with an RCE

since the last Office Action was made final. The Examiner stated that he would not issue a final first Office Action in response to the filing of the RCE.

Accordingly, without intending to acquiesce to the Examiner's aforementioned prior art rejection and in order to expedite allowance of this application, the Applicants have replaced each of previously pending independent claims 8 and 32 with newly added independent claims 33 and 34 which are identical to proposed amended claims 8 and 32, respectively, which were faxed to the Examiner subsequent to the Personal Interview. Accordingly, it is submitted that each of the newly added independent claims 33-34 is clearly patentably distinguished from the Sakurai reference. Provided next is a "Substance of the Interview" which provides a summary of the argument presented during the personal interview.

First, it is noted that the Examiner has asserted that the elements shown in Figure 1 of the Sakurai reference allegedly disclose the features of the present invention as previously claimed in independent claim 8 of the present application. Particularly, the Examiner relied on the input unit 101, mark database 103, control unit 105, and the display unit 104 shown in Figure 1 of the Sakurai reference for allegedly disclosing the invention as particularly claimed in previous independent claim 8 of the present application.

The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's aforementioned assertion. It is noted that Figure 1 of the Sakurai reference depicts the internal components of information retrieval apparatus shown in Figure 2 [see Figs. 1 & 2 and column 8 (lines 55-60)]. Namely, the information retrieval apparatus 201 is used for retrieving and displaying handwritten data, which has been inputted from a handwritten data input unit such as a tablet, according to a designation from a user [see Figs. 2 and column 1 (lines 8-13)]. As is clear from Figures 1 & 2 and column 8 (lines 55-60), each of the input unit 101, handwritten memo database 102, mark database 103, display unit 104 and control unit 105 is contained within a single and integrated information retrieval apparatus 201 clearly shown in Figure 2.

On the contrary, according to the present invention as recited in newly added independent claim 33, a computer terminal device is provided having a portable body, being operable to access an external database through the use of an external search unit and being operable to output content to an external supply device. It is strongly submitted that the

Sakurai reference fails to disclose these claimed features. Moreover, it is further submitted that the Sakurai reference fails to disclose an information output terminal operable to record and hold designated content corresponding to the at least one search result selected by the selecting unit, and directly send the designated content to the external supply device so as to designate the operation of the external supply device, as particularly recited in newly added independent claim 33 of the present application.

Moreover, according to the present invention as recited in newly added independent claim 34, a computer information forwarding system is provided to include a first device operable to access a database of a second device through the use of a search unit of the second device and being operable to output content to a third device. It is strongly submitted that the Sakurai reference fails to disclose these claimed features. Moreover, it is further submitted that the Sakurai reference fails to disclose first, second, and third devices, each of the first, second, and third devices, being separate from the other devices, as particularly recited in newly added independent claim 34 of the present application.

Thus, as agreed to by the Examiner, the Applicants submit that the Sakurai reference relied upon by the Examiner clearly fails to disclose or suggest the features of the present invention as recited in each of newly added independent claims 33 and 34 of the present application.


In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present invention is clearly allowable and the Examiner is kindly requested to promptly pass this case to issuance.

Application No.: 09/913,614
Amendment Dated: August 11, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action of: March 23, 2005

MTS-3278US

In the event, however, that the Examiner has any comments or suggestion of a nature necessary to place this case in condition for allowance, then the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the Applicants' representatives to expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,


Daniel N. Calder, Reg. No. 27,424
Jack J. Jankovitz, Reg. No. 42,690
Attorneys for Applicants

DNC/JJJ/dmw/ds

Dated: August 11, 2005

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on August 11, 2005.

Deborah Spratt



D:\I:\MTS\3278US\AMEND03(SHELL).DOC